

Subject Code	ENGL338
Subject Title	Intercultural Pragmatics in Business
Credit Value	3
Level	3
Pre-requisite / Co-requisite/ Exclusion	None
Objectives	The subject is designed to extend a critical understanding of pragmatic meaning in intercultural contexts and to enable students to critically apply pragmatic principles to the interpretation and discussion of meaning in both written and spoken texts, with a focus on intercultural business and professional contexts. The subject encourages students to reflect upon and discuss the cultural influences which impact meaning, especially in professional communication contexts.
Intended Learning Outcomes	<p>Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to:</p> <p>Category A: Professional/academic knowledge and skills</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. understand and apply the concepts of intercultural pragmatics to the critical analysis of the effectiveness and appropriacy of spoken and written English in professional contexts and to then reflect and generalise from the findings; b. critically evaluate and justify the suitability of pragmatic theories and frameworks and tools in analysing, interpreting and discussing professional intercultural interaction; c. synthesise and effectively apply intercultural pragmatic approaches to the analysis of new (or unseen) professional interaction; <p>Category B: Attributes for all-roundedness</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> d. have a more global outlook in combination with a critical understanding of the importance of culture in determining pragmatic meaning in intercultural contexts; e. employ a range of strategies for effective communication and learning autonomously and collaboratively; and f. have a more grounded sense of social and national responsibility, leadership and entrepreneurship through an enhanced understanding of the achievement of meaning in intercultural contexts.
Subject Synopsis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An introduction to inter-language, cross-cultural and intercultural pragmatics 2. Approaches to pragmatics research

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The nature and sources of pragmatic failure 4. Speech acts in intercultural discourse 5. Cultural preferences for rhetorical strategies 6. Levels of indirectness across cultures 7. Interpersonal politeness and power in intercultural contexts 8. Successful negotiation of meaning in intercultural professional contexts 																																														
Teaching/ Learning Methodology	<p>In addition to interactive lectures and seminars, online learning and additional reading take the students deeper into the concepts, ideas and application of intercultural pragmatics in professional interaction.</p>																																														
Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Specific assessment methods/tasks</th> <th rowspan="2">% weighting</th> <th colspan="6">Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>a</th> <th>b</th> <th>c</th> <th>d</th> <th>e</th> <th>f</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. In-class tests</td> <td>30%</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Group seminar presentation</td> <td>20%</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Two written assignments totaling 3000 words</td> <td>50%</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100 %</td> <td colspan="6"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>All of the assignments are designed to assess students' abilities to critically apply the theoretical concepts and frameworks covered in the subject. They provide students with tasks that require the evaluation, synthesis and application of intercultural pragmatics to the critical analysis, interpretation and discussion of spoken and written professional interaction. All of the data studied in the subject are authentic and most are drawn from professional contexts in Hong Kong.</p>	Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)						a	b	c	d	e	f	1. In-class tests	30%	✓	✓	✓				2. Group seminar presentation	20%	✓	✓	✓				3. Two written assignments totaling 3000 words	50%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Total	100 %						
Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting			Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)																																											
		a	b	c	d	e	f																																								
1. In-class tests	30%	✓	✓	✓																																											
2. Group seminar presentation	20%	✓	✓	✓																																											
3. Two written assignments totaling 3000 words	50%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓																																									
Total	100 %																																														
Student Study Effort Required	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Class contact:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Lectures</td> <td>26 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Seminars</td> <td>13 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other student study effort:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Private study</td> <td>58 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Take-home assignments</td> <td>29 Hrs.</td> </tr> </table>	Class contact:		▪ Lectures	26 Hrs.	▪ Seminars	13 Hrs.	Other student study effort:		▪ Private study	58 Hrs.	▪ Take-home assignments	29 Hrs.																																		
Class contact:																																															
▪ Lectures	26 Hrs.																																														
▪ Seminars	13 Hrs.																																														
Other student study effort:																																															
▪ Private study	58 Hrs.																																														
▪ Take-home assignments	29 Hrs.																																														

	Total student study effort	126 Hrs.
Reading List and References	<p>Recommended reading</p> <p>Cheng, W. and Warren, M. (2005). // → well have a <u>DIF</u>ferent // ↘ <u>THIN</u>king you know //: A corpus-driven Study of disagreement in Hong Kong business discourse. In M. Gotti and F. Bargiela-Chiappini (Eds.), <i>Asian Business Discourses</i>. Frankfurt am main: Peter Lang. 241-270.</p> <p>Cheng, W. and Warren, M. (2006). "// → you need to be <u>RUTH</u>less //:Entertaining cross-cultural differences. <i>Language & Intercultural Communication</i>, 6(1),35-56.</p> <p>Kasper, G., & Rose, K.S. (2002). <i>Pragmatic Development in a Second Language</i>. Oxford: Blackwell.</p> <p>Murphy, M. and Levy, M. (2006). Politeness in intercultural email communication: Australian and Korean Perspectives. <i>Journal of Intercultural Communication</i>, 12: 1404-1634.</p> <p>Pan, Yuling. (2000). <i>Politeness in Chinese Face-to-Face Interaction</i>. Stamford, CT: Ablex.</p> <p>Pütz, M. and Aertselaer, J. (Eds.) (2008). <i>Developing Contrastive Pragmatics: Interlanguage and Cross-Cultural Perspectives</i>. Berlin: New York: Mouton de Gruyter.</p> <p>Spencer-Oatey, H. (Ed.) (2008). <i>Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory</i>. London; New York: Continuum.</p> <p>Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. <i>Applied Linguistics</i>, 4/2, 91-112.</p> <p>Further reading</p> <p>Gao, G., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1998). <i>Communicating Effectively with the Chinese</i>. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.</p> <p>Grundy, P. (2001). <i>Doing Pragmatics</i> (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.</p> <p>Nelson, G. L., Carson, J., Al Batal, M. and El Bakary, W. (2002). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. <i>Applied Linguistics</i>, 23(2): 163-189.</p> <p>Pan, Y., Scollon, S.W. and Scollon, R. (2002). <i>Professional Communication in International Settings</i>. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.</p>	

Prepared by Winnie Cheng and Martin Warren; Revised by Martin Warren, June 2014